

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed on October 17, 2007, the Examiner took the following action: (1) rejected claims 1-17 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Frerebeau (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2003/0135501), by Kerr (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2004/0088155), and further in view of Allard (U.S. Patent no. 6,370,561); and (2) rejected claims 18 – 25 as being unpatentable over Frerebeau (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2003/0135501), and further in view of Allard (U.S. Patent no. 6,370,561). Applicants respectfully request entry of the amended claims and reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103(A)

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Frerebeau (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2003/0135501), by Kerr (U.S. App. Pub. No. US 2004/0088155), and further in view of Allard (U.S. Patent no. 6,370,561). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

### Claims 1-9

Turning now to the specific language of the claims, amended Claim 1 recites:

A method of providing localization of a web service, comprising:  
receiving an HTML page request via a network from a client web browser in a requester of the web service;  
identifying a culture associated with the HTML page request by examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to identify culture identifiers;  
identifying a localization attribute and one or more values associated with the localization attribute in a requested page associated with the HTML page request;

determining whether one of a plurality of satellite assemblies is associated with the identified culture;

referencing the satellite assembly associated with the identified culture to locate content in the satellite assembly associated with each of the one or more values associated with the localization attribute, the satellite assembly being configured to provide the content prior to execution by a server of a script embedded in the requested page;

replacing the identified one or more values associated with the localization attribute in the requested page with the content associated with the each of the one or more values located in the referenced satellite assembly;

running scripts embedded in the requested web page with the replaced identified values associated with the localization attribute in the requested page to provide a culture-dependent response; and

transmitting the culture-dependent response to the client web browser in the requester of the web service.

Support for identifying a culture is found in the applicants specification, page 7 lines 14 – 16, and support for running scripts embedded in the requested web page is found in applicants specification, page 8, lines 17 -19. Neither Frerebeau, Kerr nor Berg disclose, teach, or fairly suggest the method recited in claim 1. Specifically, Frerebeau, Kerr and Berg fail to teach or fairly suggest a method that includes “receiving an HTML page request via a network from a client web browser in a requester of the web service; identifying a culture associated with the HTML page request by examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to identify culture identifiers” and “running scripts embedded in the requested web page with the replaced identified values associated with the localization attribute in the requested page to provide a culture-dependent response;” as recited in claim 1.

The Office cites Frerebeau for referencing a satellite assembly associated with the identified culture to locate an identifier associated with each value associated with the localization attribute; however, there is no indication in Frerebeau of receiving a web page request from a requester of the web service as

recited in claim 1. The office cites Kerr for the users specifies to a process the local specific information that references one or more localization objects and delivering objects combined with an application to users to fulfill their requests; however, there is no indication in Kerr of the HTTP web page request being examined to identify the culture that the provided web page needs to be localized. Kerr requires that user needs to provide a step of specifying local information to the server. Applicant does not require this extra step of specifying local information to the server, applicant examines HTTP page requests originating from a web browser to determine a culture while simultaneously determining which web page to provide to the client.

Finally neither Frerebeau nor Kerr disclose injected localized content on the web page prior to execution of a script for the requested page. Allard discloses encoding a DLL script from a URL and then loading the entire DLL, which is different from substituting localized content on a web page, and then executing a script from the page on the localized content. Also Allard does not disclose the deficiency of Kerr or Frerebeau of examining content contained in a web page request to identify the culture of the request from the content.

In summary applicant, in a single browser request, provides a method for localizing content on a web page by analyzing content embedded in the request, and then executes a script on the localized web page. Applicant's method makes providing localized content more efficient (fewer steps) and allows localization without having to change web page content.

Accordingly, as the above cited elements are not shown or suggested in any of the references, claim 1 is allowable over Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard. Claims

2-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least due to their dependency on claim 1, and also due to additional limitations recited in those claims.

### **Claims 10-17**

Similarly, amended claim 10 recites:

A computing-based system for providing localization of a web service, comprising:

a server receiving a page request via a network from an agent;

a culture identification module configured to identify a culture associated with the received page request by analyzing content embedded in the page request to identify culture parameters;

a localization values parsing module configured to identify a localization attribute and values in a requested page associated with the page request;

a key values parser configured to locate localized content associated with the localization attributes and localization values and to designate the localized content to replace content referenced by the localization attributes and localization values in the requested page;

a satellite assembly, selected using the culture identified by analyzing the page request, that includes the localized content located by the key values parser, the satellite assembly providing the localized content to replace content on the requested page prior to a server executing a script containing the localized content embedded in the requested page; and

wherein the localized content is associated with the identified culture and is utilized when the requested page is served to the agent making the page request

As described more fully above, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard do not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest the system recited in claim 10. Specifically, Frerebeau, Kerr and Allard fail to teach or fairly suggest a computing-based system that includes “a culture identification module configured to identify a culture associated with the received page request by analyzing content embedded in the page request to identify culture parameters” as recited in claim 10. Therefore, claim 10 is not anticipated by Frerebeau. Claims 11-17 depend from claim 10 and

are allowable at least due to their dependency on claim 10, and also due to additional limitations recited in those claims.

### **Claims 18-25**

Amended claim 18 now recites:

One or more computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following steps:

receiving via a network an HTTP page request from a client for web content for a preferred culture;

identifying the preferred culture by examining content embedded in the HTTP page request;

determining if localized web content corresponding to the preferred culture is available;

localizing the web content for the preferred culture if localized web content is available for the preferred culture;

localizing the web content for a default culture if localized web content is not available for the preferred culture, wherein at least one of localizing the web content for the preferred culture and localizing the web content for a default culture includes referencing one of a plurality of satellite assemblies, selected using the identified preferred culture from the page request, to provide a localized content associated with at least one of the preferred culture and the default culture, the referenced satellite assembly being configured to replace the localized web content with non-localized web content on the requested page prior to the computer executing a script, said script being embedded in the requested page with the provided localized web content so that when the script is executed with the provided localized web content attributes of the requested page are known before being transmitted to the client;

executing the script within the requested page with the provided localized web content; and

delivering the requested page *with the executed script* to the client via a network. (emphasis added).

Again, as described more fully above, Frerebeau, and Allard do not disclose, teach, or fairly suggest the computer-readable media recited in amended claim 18. Specifically, Frerebeau fails to teach or fairly suggest a computer-

readable media that includes “identifying the preferred culture by examining content embedded in the HTTP page request” and “executing the script within the requested page with the provided localized web content;” as recited in claim 18. Neither Allard or Frerebeau discloses a script within the requested page that is executed. Frerebeau does not disclose executing a script on a page. Allard only discloses a dll that is executed from decoding the URL provided by the sending device. As neither reference discloses executing a script within the requested page with the provided localized web content, claim 18 is patentable over Frerebeau in view of Allard.

Claims 19-25 depend from amended claim 18 and are allowable at least due to their dependency on claim 18, and also due to additional limitations recited in those claims. Further claim 24 has been amended to recite “wherein examining content embedded in the HTTP page request comprises identifying headers embedded in the HTTP page request associated with a particular culture, identifying culture identifiers within the headers, or examining the page request to identify culture parameters associated with the page request.” These recitations of examining the content embedded in the HTTP page request are not disclosed in the cited references and thus claim 24 is allowable over the art of record.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-25 and allowance of same. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 10/31/2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Steven C. Stewart  
Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Reg. No. 33,555  
(206) 315-7909